

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Applicant requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview on September 8, 2009. Independent claim 1 was discussed in light of Beranek et al. (UK Patent Application GB2329309, published March 17, 1999, “Beranek”) and Chiloyan et al. (U.S. Patent 7,165,109, filed January 12, 2001, “Chiloyan”). In particular, the teachings of the prior art were contrasted with the limitations recited in claim 1. In light of the discussion, the Examiner indicated claim 1 may be allowable over the cited prior art, if amended to clarify that the device internal information is displayed using the information browsing unit.

The amendments herein reflect amendments discussed during the interview.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beranek and further in view of Chiloyan.

Applicant submits that the references, alone or in combination, do not teach all of the limitations of the rejected claims.

Beranek describes, “a discovery mechanism for use with a Web appliance or system in which the system may discover the characteristics of the various display components therein and then *re-format Web content* accordingly to enhance the ‘look and feel’ of such content for the discovered characteristics.” (Beranek at 5:7-11, emphasis added.) Beranek further describes, “[t]he method preferably uses the client side HTTP caching proxy *to intercept the Web document* and then dynamically rewrites the document before it is displayed on the browser associated with the Web appliance.” (*Id.* at 6:8-11, emphasis added.) Thus, Applicant asserts that Beranek discloses a method of intercepting an HTTP web document, and then altering its format to conform to the

display capabilities of a client device or Web appliance. In other words, Beranek adapts an HTTP web document that is *already configured to be displayed on a browser* to fit the specific format requirements of a client display.

Beranek does not teach the necessary “device information providing unit” required by claim 1. In particular, Beranek does not disclose or suggest a device information providing unit that “generates display data containing the device internal information and having a structure equivalent to the prescribed structure of the layout data generated by the information browsing unit and displays the generated display data through the information browsing unit.”

Furthermore, Applicant submits that Chiloyan does not remedy the deficiencies in the Beranek disclosure. Relevant portions of Chiloyan describe:

At step 170, the user runs the Device Manager program available through the control panel of Microsoft Corporation’s WINDOWS operating system. The Device Manager displays a list of all hardware devices connected to the system including peripheral devices that contain a URL.

...

At a step 174, the Device Manager begins to display the device property sheet that has tabs to various pages of properties pertaining to the selected peripheral device.

(Chiloyan at 14:7-17.)

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the “properties pertaining to the selected peripheral device” is analogous to device internal information, Chiloyan simply teaches the display of the properties within a Device Manager program. This differs from the method of claim 1 in at least the following ways.

First, Chiloyan does not disclose a device information providing unit that “generates display data containing the device internal information and having a structure equivalent to the prescribed structure of the layout data generated by the information browsing unit.” Because Chiloyan uses the Device Manager program to display the device property sheet, Chiloyan does not generate display data having a structure equivalent to the prescribed structure of the layout data generated by an information browsing unit.

Additionally, Chiloyan does not disclose or suggest displaying the generated display data through the information browsing unit, as required by claim 1.

Applicant asserts that Beranek and Chiloyan, either alone or combined, do not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1 and therefore fail to render claim 1 obvious. Applicant also submits that independent claims 10 and 19 are not rendered obvious for at least the reasons discussed above. Dependent claims 2-9 and 11-18 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1-19 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 448252001600. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: September 14, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Peter J. Yim/

Peter J. Yim

Registration No.: 44,417

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

425 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94105-2482

(415) 268-6373